1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (S.C.BN 9990) United States Attorney JOANN M. SWANSON (SBN 88143) Chief, Civil Division JONATHAN U. LEE (SBN 148792) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Ninth Floor San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-6909 Facsimile: (415) 436-6748 Email: jonathan.lee@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Federal Defendants	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12	M. HOPE YOUNG,	No. C 07-2413 JSW
13	Plaintiff,)	PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS
14 15	V.)	Date: December 21, 2007 Time: 9:00 a.m.
16	ALPHONSO JACKSON, SECRETARY OF) THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND) URBAN DEVELOPMENT; FAYE)	Place: Courtroom 2, 17 th Floor 450 Golden Gate Avenue
17	AUSTIN; MARC ROTHBERG; AND (GEORGE WEIDENFELLER,)	San Francisco, CA Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White
18	Defendants.	
19)	
20		
21		
22	FOR GOOD CAUSE, the Court GRANTS the motion.	
23	Plaintiff's exclusive remedy for workplace discrimination in her federal employment are her	
24	first, third and fifth causes of action under Title VII. Brown v. General Services Administration,	
25	425 U.S. 820, 829 (1976)(Title VII is "an exclusive, preemptive administrative and judicial	
26	scheme for the redress of federal employment discrimination"); White v. General Services	
27	Administration, 652 F.2d 913, 916-17 (9th Cir. 1981) (affirming dismissal of claims brought	
28	under other federal statutes, including 42 U.S.C. §1981). Plaintiff's second and fourth causes of	
	PROPOSED ORDER ON MOTION TO DISMISS C 07-2413 JSW	-1-

action are dismissed with prejudice.

Plaintiff's Title VII claims may only be brought against the head of the federal agency she worked for and only in that person's official capacity. White v. General Services Administration, 652 F.2d 913, 916-17, n.4 (9th Cir. 1981); see also Greenlaw v. Garrett, 59 F.3d 994, 1001 (9th Cir. 1995) ("Under Title VII there is no personal liability for employees, including supervisors ..."). Therefore, only Secretary Jackson (in an official capacity only) is a proper defendant in this case and defendants Rothberg, Weidenfeller and Austin are dismissed with prejudice.

Title VII does not permit a punitive damages claim against the federal government. The statute provides: "A complaining party may recover punitive damages under this section against a respondent (other than a government, government agency or political subdivision) if the complaining party demonstrates that the respondent engaged in a discriminatory practice or discriminatory practices with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of an aggrieved individual." 42 U.S.C. §1981A(b)(1). Therefore, plaintiff's claim for punitive damages is inappropriate and will be stricken from the new amended complaint.

Plaintiff shall have ten days from the date of this order to file a new amended complaint consistent with this Order. Defendant Jackson shall have up to ten days thereafter to file his answer or other responsive pleading.

SO ORDERED.

JEFFREY S. WHITE United States DISTRICT JUDGE
